SEP-08-2004 17:31 FOXCONN 408 919 8353 P.07

Appl. No. 10/617,056 Amdt. Dated Sep. 8,2004 Reply to Office Action of June 8, 2004

## REMARKS

Following the Examiner's suggestion, applicant has rewritten original claims 8 and 15 in independent form (now claim 1 and 11) including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, the amended claims 1 and 11 should be allowable.

Claims 2-6 and 12-13 are also believed to be allowable since they depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 and 11.

## Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claim 9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Examiner believes that claim 9 recites that the insulative housing is L-shaped. However, claim 9 only defines that the insulative housing defines an L-shaped receiving space but does not define that the insulative housing has an L-shaped configuration. It is detailedly described in paragraph [0019] of the specification of the present application that the insulative housing comprises opposite top and bottom walls 13, 14, and opposite side walls 15, and the top, bottom and side walls together define an L-shaped receiving space 18 therebetween for receiving a mating portion of a complementary connector. Furthermore, FIG. 1 of the present application clearly discloses a reversed L-shaped receiving space 18.

Appl. No. 10/617,056 Amdt. Dated Sep. 8,2004 Reply to Office Action of June 8, 2004

Since both Figure 1 and corresponding description clearly disclose an L-shaped receiving space 18 enabling skilled in the art to understand and embody the invention, as a result, rejection to claim 9 under 35 USC 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph is respectively traversed.

## Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 16-18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Endo et al.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with Examiner's viewpoint. Detailed reasons are given below.

Claim 16 defines a plurality of straight type <u>tails of contacts extending</u> rearward out of the rear portion of the insulative housing. However, it is clearly seen from FIG 3 of Endo et al. that the female terminal 8 is wholly received in the housing body 2 and does NOT have a tail extending rearward out of a rear portion of the housing body.

In addition, claim 16 further defines an insulative cover <u>molded</u> over and <u>fully engaged</u> with and <u>supporting</u> at least the <u>said angled section of said outer</u> <u>jacket</u>. So by means of over-molding, the insulative cover is integrally engaged with the outer jacket of the cable and the insulative cover cannot separate from the cable unless destroyed. However, it is clearly disclosed in column 4, lines 27-28 of the specification of Endo et al. that the housing cover 14 is set on the housing 1 to <u>spatially</u> cover the lead wire 15. Therefore, the housing cover 14 is <u>NOT</u> molded

Appl. No. 10/617,056 Amdt. Dated Sep. 8,2004 Reply to Office Action of June 8, 2004

over and fully engaged with and supporting the angled section of the lead wire 15; oppositely the cover 14 can be easily detached from the housing 1 and not efficiently absorb the impact applied to the wire 15. Accordingly, the insulative cover of claim 16 is substantially different from that of Endo et al. Thus, independent claim 16 is believed to be patentable over Endo et al.

Claims 17 and 18 are dependent to claim 16, since claim 16 is patentably defined over the cited prior art, claims 17 and 18 are also in a position of allowance.

In view of the above claim amendments and remarks, the subject application is believed to be in a condition for allowance and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

**Huang Hsin** 

Registration No. 43,325 Foxconn International, Inc.

P. O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive,

Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel No.: (408) 919-6137